

## REMARKS

### Interview Summary

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the time that was generously extended during the March 23, 2010 telephonic interview. In response to the interview, the Applicants have amended the claims as discussed during the March 23, 2010 interview in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. As was discussed during the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 interview, the Applicants suggested amending the claims to allowable form by (1) including the limitations of certain claims that were not rejected in the broadest generic compound claims and (2) by deleting the non-elected subject matter in accordance to page 4 of the December 1, 2009 office action (see comments under Claim Objections). Specifically, Applicants have (1) amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 11 and 12, and have amended both of rings B and C to phenyl; (2) amended claim 16 to include the limitations of claim 19, and have amended both of rings B and C to phenyl; and (3) amended claim 27 to require the elements of claims 11 and 12 and to have rings B and C be phenyl. Applicants did not use any exhibits during the interview. The prior art that was discussed was WO 02/06246. Claims 1, 11, 12, 21, and 27 were discussed. Applicants preserve the right to prosecute all cancelled claims and deleted subject matter in continuing patent applications.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office has maintained the rejection claims 1, 2, 4-10, 16-18, 21-22, 24 and 28 under U.S.C. § 102(b), alleging that these claims are anticipated by WO 02/06246. The Office specifically alleges that the carboxyl substituent of the substituted pyrimidinyl group required in WO 02/06246 is R<sup>3</sup> or R<sup>30</sup> in the instant claims. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Applicants have incorporated elements of claims 11 and 12 into claim 1, and have incorporated the elements of claim 19 into claim 16, thereby rendering these rejections moot and placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

The Office has maintained the rejection of claims 16-18, 21, 22 and under U.S.C. § 102(b), alleging that these claims are anticipated by Auzou et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Applicants have incorporated the elements of claim 19 into claim 16. Accordingly, this rejection has been rendered moot by this amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

#### Claim Objections

The Office stated that the claims are not in condition for allowance because they contain non-elected subject matter.

As stated above, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 16 and 27 to delete all non-elected subject matter by requiring that both rings B and C are phenyl. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 1, 2010

By: /Bradley W. Crawford/  
Bradley W. Crawford  
Reg. No. 50,494

McDonnell Boehnen  
Hulbert & Berghoff LLP  
32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 913-2114 (direct)  
Tel: (312) 913-0001 (general)